

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the Final Office Action mailed November 20, 2008. Reconsideration of the subject application in light of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the brief telephone interview conducted on December 3, 2008 where Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed the possibility of an Examiner's Amendment to cancel claim 21.

**Claim Status:**

By this Amendment rejected claim 21 has been cancelled. Thus claims 1 – 3, 5 – 14, 16 – 20, and 22 – 24 are currently pending for further action.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

In the aforementioned Office Action the Examiner allowed claims 1 – 3, 5 – 14, 16 – 20, and 22 – 24. (Note however, that only claims 1 – 3, 5 – 14, and 16 – 20 were shown allowed in the Office Action Summary, yet on page 3, section 3 of the Office Action claims 1 – 3, 5 – 14, 16 – 20, and 22 – 24 are shown as allowed.) Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims. Applicants continue to agree with the Examiner's conclusions regarding patentability, without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the Examiner's reasoning.

Conclusion:

Entry and consideration of this amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 for at least the following reasons. The present Amendment makes only those changes necessary to place the application in condition for allowance as was indicated by the Examiner. The Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. And, based on the indications of the Examiner, the present Amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of the present Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and is hereby requested.

In view of the foregoing arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Final Office Action.

Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the Amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas S. Neal, et al.

By: 

Douglas M. Gilbert  
Reg No. 27,196

December 3, 2008

Hewlett-Packard Company  
M/S 4059  
19483 Pruneridge Ave.  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
(408) 447-4447